

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-11, 13-15, and 30-31 are currently pending in this application. Claims 17-29 and 32 have been canceled by this reply, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 13, 30, and 31 are independent. The remaining claims depend from claims 1 and 13.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 13, 30, and 31 have been amended for purposes of clarification. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at least on Figure 3 and pages 4, 24, and 25 of the Specification.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13, 15, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the European Telecommunication Standard (ETS) in view of US Patent No. 6,421,359 ("Bennett"). For the reasons below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

In embodiments of the present disclosure, commercial operators share a transport stream, which means that there are multiple BATs (one for each commercial operator) in a *single* transport stream. As it has been explained previously, every BAT in the transport stream has the same PID and TID values, so it is impossible for a decoder to distinguish between the different BATs using this information only.

To solve this technical problem, the invention uses the fact that, in practice, a difference between different BATs is found in the PID extension that is equal to the bouquet ID values assigned by a supervisory organisation. *See* Specification, page 24, lines 3-14. Accordingly, the transmitting system (who transmits the transport stream), includes in *a specific table* additional information in the transport stream. This additional information enables the decoder to decide which BAT corresponds to which commercial bouquet.

In ETS, a transport stream is used by one commercial operator only. The commercial operator offers a number of channels and services in this transport stream. Information about these services is included in a Bouquet Association Table (BAT), which has fixed PID and TID values of 0x011 and 0x44, respectively. Thus, in order to access information about the services available in the transport stream, the decoder accesses the BAT simply by looking in packets with the correct PID and TID values. This is described on page 2, line 23 to page 3, line 3.

Turning to the rejection, the Examiner admits that ETS fails to teach or suggest two different BRTs in a single transport stream and identifying at least two BRTs in the one transport stream to allow the identified BRTs to be downloaded. *See* Action mailed December 24, 2008, p. 3. In addition, ETS also fails to teach or suggest *a separate and distinct table* (i.e., the other table claimed) that comprises a list of bouquet identity values associated with the BRTs carried by the one transport stream, where the bouquet identify values are used to identify the at least two BRTs, as required by the amended claims. In fact, by the Examiner's admission that ETS fails to teach or suggest identifying at least to BRTs to be downloaded, it logically follows that ETS would not teach or suggest the bouquet identity values that allow for the at least two BRTs to be identified. In other words, it would not be necessary to include bouquet identity values to

identify BRTs in ETS, because ETS does not identify BRTs to be downloaded. Thus, ETS does not even suggest including bouquet identity values in a separate table.

Further, Bennett fails to supply that which ETS lacks. Bennett discloses how to build a single transport stream from a first and second transport stream, each of the first and second transport streams containing PID. As mentioned in column 2, lines 39-41 of Bennett, the PIDs associated with one source stream conflict with the PIDs associated with one or more other source streams.

Bennett fails to teach an additional table included in the single transport stream that includes bouquet identity values to identify at least two BRTs. Bennett proposes, as mentioned by the Examiner, to multiplex the separate transport streams into a singular output transport stream; thereby ensuring that no PID from different streams conflict with each other. However, Bennett does not show or suggest how to download a specific bouquet from the single transport stream. Thus, it logically follows that Bennett would have no use for a separate additional table for identifying at least two BRTs to be able to download the identified BRTs, as required by the amended independent claims.

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1, 13, 30, and 31 are patentable over ETS and Bennett, whether considered separately or in combination. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 and 14

Claims 3-5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ETS, Bennett, and further in view of “Issues in Multiplex and Service Management in Digital Multichannel Broadcasting,” by Cartwright (“Cartwright”).

As described above, ETS and Bennett fail to teach or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims. Further, Cartwright fails to supply that which ETS and Bennett lack. Specifically, Cartwright fails to show or suggest a separate table including bouquet identity values used to identify the at least two BRTs to be downloaded. Cartwright merely teaches a network information table.

In view of the above, it is clear that the independent claims are patentable over ETS, Bennett, and Cartwright, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 3 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number [11345/033001]).

Dated: April 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant